

Remarks

Claims 1-12 were in the application as last examined. Claims 1 and 9 are amended, for which no new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request further examination and consideration in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,215,446 to Sullivan et al. The rejections are traversed.

The claimed invention is not anticipated under §102 unless each and every element of the claimed invention is found in the prior art. *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 231 USPQ 81, 90 (Fed. Cir. 1986). To anticipate, a single reference must teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. *Eolas Technologies Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 399 F.3d 1325, 1335; 73 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1782 (Fed. Cir. 2005). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The rejection fails to satisfy these standards.

Applicant's prior remarks are carried forward and incorporated herein as if restated. The Examiner asserts that the electrically conductive tube 64 of Sullivan et al. '446 is one transmission line and the spring contact 56 is the second transmission line. It is noted, however, that the electrically conductive tube 64 does not connect to the spring contact 56 at the junction as required in claims 1 and 9. Because this limitation is not found in Sullivan et al. '446, the reference cannot be said to anticipate the claims.

Because Sullivan et al. '446 does not disclose a transmission line in each of the whip and the mount or in each of the lower and upper section assemblies, connected to each other or adapted to connect to each other at the junction, it does not anticipate

claims 1 and 9. Likewise, because claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9, they are also not anticipated.

Conclusion

The allowability of claims 2-8 and 12 is acknowledged with thanks, but given the forgoing remarks, all claims are believed allowable over the art of record. Consequently, early notice of allowability is respectfully requested. Any questions about the foregoing can be directed to the undersigned and the Examiner is invited to resolve any remaining issues by telephone or by email.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL E. MILLER

Dated: October 15, 2007

By: /Joel E Bair/

Joel E. Bair, Reg. No. 33,356
McGARRY BAIR PC
32 Market SW, Suite 500
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
616-742-3500
Fax 616-742-1010
E-mail jeb@mcgarrybair.com